

Serial No. 09/225,208

REMARKS**STATUS OF CLAIMS**

Claim 1-28 are pending and are rejected.

Independent claims 1, 21, 24, 27 and 28 are amended.

Thus, claims 1-28 remain pending for reconsideration, which is respectfully requested.

No new matter has been added in this Amendment. The claim rejections are hereby traversed.

35 USC 112, FIRST PARAGRAPH, REJECTION

Dependent claim 4 is rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph.

In particular, the Examiner maintains the non-enabling rejection that the specification does not include an "emergency worker group", but only an "emergency group." The Applicants note that the original claim 1 recited, "A system for managing resources including windows, objects, and data among *groups of workers* that carry out jobs by computers, comprising: ..." Therefore, a group is made up of workers, thus, providing support for a "worker group." Further, the original claim 4 recited, "an emergency group."

Page 9, lines 21-24 of the specification speaks for itself and can be understood by one skilled in the art as being a group of workers (any type of workers as desired according to application design) who are allowed access to every resource of every group. In response to a trouble notice from the job monitor 2, the emergency group 6 tries to solve the problem (page 9, lines 21-24 of the specification).

Further, page 8, lines 12-15 of the specification, discloses that a group consists of workers, i.e., member, thereby the makeup of a group not being limiting. Any type of member can be designated to solve a problem in an emergency.

Therefore, "an emergency worker group" is enabled.

Withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claim 4 is respectfully requested, and because the Examiner does not provide any prior art rejection for dependent claim 4, it is understood that dependent claim 4 is allowable.

Serial No. 09/225,208

35 USC 112, SECOND PARAGRAPH, REJECTION

Claims 23 and 26 are rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph. The Examiner asserts that dependent claims 23 and 26 are indefinite, because of the indefinite grammatical structure.

However, dependent claims 23 and 26 are definite, because these claims clearly recite, "wherein ***as the job object conditions***, each job definition form ***identifies for each worker group***, information indicating the rights to use the job objects, and at least one of a job period, worker group members, processes, the job objects allocated to the job carried out by the worker group, and permission information of the job objects."

In other words, each job definition form identifies for each worker group the job object conditions, as supported by FIG. 9 of the present Application. FIGS. 9 and 36 expressly disclose, "GROUP A (JOB A1) ... GROUP Z (JOB Z1)," members of the "GROUPS A-Z," and the jobs, resources (job objects), and permission information of the job objects of each group, such as "GROUP A (JOB A1): resource ([window, ...], [object, ...], [data1, ...])," "CONTACT ADDRESS ... WORKER 1: PRIORITY, ...," and "WINDOW: (PERMISSION, PERIOD, PERMISSION PROCEDURE)." See, page 16, lines 14-30 of the specification.

The Applicants believe that the grammatical structure of dependent claims 23 and 26 is correct. Withdrawal of the indefiniteness rejection is respectfully requested.

35 USC 103 REJECTIONS

1. The rejection of claims 1, 3, 5, 21, 24, 27 and 28 are maintained under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fargher (US Patent No. 5,826,040) in view of Matsuzaki (US Patent No. 5,767,848). Page 3, item 5 of the Action.

2. The rejection of dependent claims 4, 6, and 11-15 are maintained under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fargher, Matsuzaki, and "IBM Disclosure Bulletin." Page 6, item 6 of the Action.

3. The rejection of dependent claims 2, 22-23, and 25-26 are maintained under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fargher, Matsuzaki, IBM Bulletin and Rapazo (PC Week). Page 8, item 7 of the Action.

4. The rejection of dependent claims 7-9 and 19 are maintained under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fargher, Matsuzaki, IBM Bulletin, Persham (US Patent No. 5,260,986), Hwang (US Patent No. 5,530,892), Gaskill (US Patent No. 5,440,559), Morishima

Serial No. 09/225,208

(US Patent No. 5,589,956) and D'Agosto (US Patent No. 4,975,896).

5. The rejection of dependent claims 10, 20, 17 and 18 are maintained under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fargher, Matsuzaki, IBM Bulletin, Waldren (US Patent No. 4,884,219), Zinsmeyer (US Patent No. 3,927,800) and Morishima.

6. The rejection of dependent claims 16 are maintained under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fargher, Matsuzaki, IBM Bulletin, Waldren, Zinsmeyer, Morishima, and Weber (US Patent No. 4,995,071).

The Office Action in pages 15-17, Reply(ies), concerning the independent claims 1, 21, 24, 27 and 28, provides:

the management objective never shifts away from managing jobs in Applicant's invention nor in prior art. As with the prior art, Applicant's invention always focuses on accomplishing job completion. It is clear that the invention manages jobs. Applicant's attempt to convert the above informality by stating "the present invention essentially processes a group of workers" is invalid logic.

More particularly, in page 15 of the Office Action, the Examiner comments, "The fact that a worker group at times only has one job on one or more of its job definition form(s) does not in actual fact convert Applicant's system to managing worker groups instead of jobs. In Applicant's invention, if the job suddenly needed to be cancelled the worker group would be taken off the job, whether or not there was another job for the worker group to do."

The independent claims 1, 21, 24, 27 and 28 are amended to emphasize the patentably distinguishing features of the present invention, as follows:

1. (CURRENTLY AMENDED) A computer system performing real-time management of object-oriented system objects as job objects among groups of workers as worker groups in communication with each other via networked computers, said computer system comprising:

a form generator generating job definition forms, each job definition form defines that define-worker groups to process, based upon job procedures, the objects of the object-oriented system as the job objects according to job-object conditions;

a resource manager managing the job-object conditions worker group by worker group in real-time based upon the job definition form;

a scheduler establishing the job-object conditions and scheduling each worker group to process the job objects,

Serial No. 09/225,208

according to each worker group job procedure defined in the job definition form; and

a job monitor performing real-time monitoring of job processing by the worker groups based upon the procedure of each worker group in the job definition form and performing real-time controlling of sharing of the job-objects among the worker groups while maintaining security of the job objects according to the job-object conditions managed by the resource manager group by group and/or member by member thereof, thereby for a first worker group or a member thereof inhibiting access to the job objects thereof from another worker group or a member thereof to which permission to use the job objects of the first worker group or the member thereof is not allocated.

Support for the claim amendments concerning managing job-object conditions "group by group and/or member by member thereof" can be found, for example, in original dependent claim 13 and FIG. 36. Job definition form 11 is disclosed, for example, in FIGS. 9 and 36 of the present Application.

In response to the Office Action comments, the Applicants note that page 10 of the present application expressly discloses, "when a group completes a job or switches a job to another [new job], the job monitor 2 automatically switches the resources of the group to others [i.e., to other resources] that are necessary for the new job [by the group]. The members of the group, therefore, can smoothly continue their work" (annotations added). In other words, contrary to the Examiner's suggestion and the Fargher, Matsuzaki, and IBM Disclosure, in the claimed present invention resources ("object-oriented system objects") of jobs are managed from perspective of a group of workers by using the "job definition forms" defined in the independent claims 1, 21, 24, 27 and 28.

The independent claims define "job definition forms, each job definition form defines that define worker groups to process, based upon job procedures, the objects of the object-oriented system as the job objects according to job-object conditions." FIGS. 51-54 provide a flow chart of the claimed present invention's dynamic use of plural resources among groups of workers using "job definition forms."

Serial No. 09/225,208

Therefore, in contrast to Fargher, Matsuzaki, and IBM Disclosure, the claimed present invention provides dynamic use of plural resources among groups of workers using "job definition forms," as follows:

1. (CURRENTLY AMENDED) A computer system performing real-time management of object-oriented system objects as job objects among groups of workers as worker groups in communication with each other via networked computers, said computer system comprising:
 - a form generator generating job definition forms, *each job definition form defines that define worker groups to process, based upon job procedures, the objects of the object-oriented system as the job objects according to job-object conditions;*
 - a resource manager managing the job-object conditions worker group by worker group in real-time based upon the job definition form;
 - a scheduler establishing the job-object conditions and scheduling each worker group to process the job objects, according to *each worker group job procedure defined in the job definition form;* and
 - a job monitor performing real-time *monitoring of job processing by the worker groups based upon the procedure of each worker group in the job definition form* and performing real-time controlling of sharing of the job-objects among the worker groups *while maintaining security of the job objects according to the job-object conditions managed by the resource manager group by group and/or member by member thereof*, thereby for a first worker group *or a member thereof* inhibiting access to the job objects thereof from another worker group *or a member thereof* to which permission to use the job objects of the first worker group *or the member thereof* is not allocated (emphasis added).

As acknowledged by the Examiner in page 4 of the Office Action, Fargher does not disclose or suggest the claimed present invention's, "job definition forms, *each job definition form defines that define worker groups* to process, *based upon job procedures,* the objects of the object-oriented system as the job objects according to job-object conditions."

So the Examiner asserts that use of forms of all kinds, particularly those drawn by hand, those preprinted and those programmed to be printed by computer printers are well known, and the use of job definition forms defining worker groups that process the job objects according to job object conditions are implicit to the description of any system managing projects, jobs and/or group of workers. Therefore, the Examiner asserts that use of forms would have been obvious within the Fargher disclosure. Pages 4-5 and page 15 of the Office Action.

Serial No. 09/225,208

As support for the Examiner's well known assertion and obviousness of the claimed present invention's "job definition forms," the Examiner in page 16 of the Office Action relies on Matsuzaki. However, Matsuzaki clearly discloses, with reference to FIG. 2, a method of supporting development and design of a new product using activity units. Matsuzaki in column 6, lines 31-41, discloses, "in each activity unit are the title of development activity, name of person in charge, restrictions, a resource model to be used for the development activity, a product model to which reference is to be made during development activity, a product model representing the results of development activity, scheduled start time, actual start time, scheduled completion time, and actual completion time." Matsuzaki in column 5, lines 51-58 discloses,

The resource models describe the abilities of facilities necessary for development, such as experimental model manufacturing facilities and testing facilities, and information about the members of the development engineering team. As shown in FIG. 2, the development activity models link the product models and the resource models connected with development activities.

Therefore, in Matsuzaki the activity unit is managed from the perspective of the task, member in charge of the task, and the personnel assigned to the task. In contrast to Matsuzaki, the claimed present invention provides dynamic use of plural resources among groups of workers using "job definition form" of the present invention, which has a benefit of allowing managing job-object conditions group by group and/or member by member. The claimed present invention's, "job definition forms, each job definition form defines that define worker groups to process, based upon job procedures, the objects of the object-oriented system as the job objects according to job-object conditions."

Matsuzaki in the paragraph spanning column s 13 and 14 discloses a member inquiring of a member in charge of a task about the task and the system monitoring the communication between the two member for analysis. In contrast the claimed present invention provides, "a job monitor performing real-time monitoring of job processing by the worker groups based upon the procedure of each worker group in the job definition form and performing real-time controlling of sharing of the job-objects among the worker groups while maintaining security of the job objects according to the job-object conditions managed by the resource manager group by group and/or member by member thereof, thereby for a first worker group or a member thereof inhibiting access to the job objects thereof from another worker group or a member thereof to which permission to use the job objects of the first worker

Serial No. 09/225,208

group or the member thereof is not allocated." In other words, Matsucaki fails to allow sharing of resources among groups of workers using "job definition form" of the present invention.

Therefore, Matsuzaki does not disclose or suggest dynamic use of plural resources among groups of workers using "job definition form" of the present invention. The Examiner's well known assertion is hereby traversed, because Matsuzaki's product model 2, development activity model 3 and resource model 4 (FIG. 1) differ from the claimed present invention's, "job definition forms, each job definition form defines that define worker groups to process, based upon job procedures, the objects of the object-oriented system as the job objects according to job-object conditions."

The Examiner also relies on the IBM Disclosure for the claimed present invention's "job definition form." Page 17 of the Office Action. The IBM Disclosure discloses a form of an Access Control List (ACL) called Access Control Entry (ACE) that defines access permissions for a computer system resource. However, the IBM Disclosure's Access Control Entry only defines access permissions with respect to one computer system resource, but differs from the claimed present invention's "job definition forms, each job definition form defines that define worker groups to process, based upon job procedures, the objects of the object-oriented system as the job objects according to job-object conditions." In other words, the IBM Disclosure's Access Control Entry cannot provide dynamic use of *plural resources among groups of workers* using "job definition form" of the present invention. Further, the IBM Disclosure's Access Control Entry does not provide the claimed present invention's, "a scheduler establishing the job-object conditions and scheduling each worker group to process the job objects, according to *each worker group procedure defined in the job definition form.*"

In view of the claim amendments and remarks, withdrawal of the rejections of pending claims and allowance of pending claims is respectfully requested.

Serial No. 09/225,208


CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

Respectfully submitted,
STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 1/26/2005

By: 
Mehdi D. Sheikerz
Registration No. 41,307

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted via facsimile to: Commissioner for Patents,
P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

on 1/26, 2005

STAAS & HALSEY

By: Mehdi Sheikerz

Date 1/26/2005